DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 311 PS 009 420

AUTHOR Goodwin, Judith
TITLE A Summary of Four Major Evaluation Reports on Follow Through in Philadelphia, 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO 77142
PUB DATE May 77
GRANT OEG-G-007-502-171
NOTE 29p.; For related documents, see PS 009 418-419

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; Ancillary Services; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Programs; Elementary Education; Mathematics; Parent Attitudes; Parent Participation; Personal Growth; *Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Reading; Social Development; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This paper presents summaries of four evaluation reports on Follow Through programs in Philadelphia, grades K-3. Section I compares the reading and mathematics achievement of children from 1971-1976 in the various Follow Through models. Included in the evaluation are the Behavior Analysis, Bank Street, Parent Implemented, Philadelphia Process, Educational Development Center, Florida Parent, and Bilingual models. Results indicate that the Behavior Analysis Model produced the greatest positive effects in reading and mathematics achievement. Section II of the report surveys personnel and parent perceptions of the program and indicates that the majority of those surveyed considered the program effective for enhancing the children's personal, social, and academic development. Section III summarizes levels of supportive services (medical, dental, psychological and social) and parent involvement. The report indicates a decrease in the level of supportive services being utilized. Section IV surveys school personnel's perceptions of the Follow Through Expansion Programs, indicating positive perceptions for the majority of staff members. Descriptions of the programs, sources of additional information, and descriptions of tests and questionnaires used for the evaluation are included in the paper. (BRD)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED142311

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A SUMMARY OF FOUR MAJOR EVALUATION REPORTS ON FOLLOW THROUGH IN PHILADELPHIA 1975-1976

Prepared by
Judith Goodwin

Report #77142
May, 1977

Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Programs

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation

Constance E. Clayton
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director

Office of Research and Evaluation
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

PS 009420

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. George Hutt

Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

****

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Dr. Robert L. Poindexter, Executive Deputy Superintendent

****

Dr. I. Ezra Staples
Deputy Superintendent for
Instructional Services

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

DISCLAIMER

The activity which is the subject of this report regarding the original, national Follow Through Program was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

ABSTRACT

Achievement data over the five years, 1971-1972 through 1975-1976 in Reading and Mathematics shows continuous improvement in Grades K-3 for the Total Program, but the Behavior Analysis Model has produced the greatest positive effect on performance.

A survey of program personnel and parents in the original Follow Through program's 18 schools indicates that the majority thought the program was helping pupils' personal, social and academic development. According to teachers across models, the most effective subject areas were Oral Expression (77%), Reading (72%), Arithmetic (69%) and Creative Activities (64%).

Supportive services information indicates that due to declining enrollment and increased costs over the years combined with the same funding, the level of services has been gradually decreasing. Fifty-one percent (51%) of those children referred for medical care received treatment, while 44% of those referred for dental care received treatment. Social service information indicates that 87% of those families in need of help received help, while parent involvement information indicates that a total of 19,615 parent volunteer hours were donated to the program.

A survey conducted in the Follow Through Expansion program indicates that the majority of principals, teachers, resource teachers, aides and parent scholars considered their instructional option effective in helping pupils' personal, social and academic development, with the exception of Option II[1] teachers. Across the program teachers considered Reading (81%), Arithmetic (72%), Handwriting Skills (67%) and Oral Expression (66%) as the most effective subject areas.

1. A Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	I:	Comparative Performance of Follow Through Models .	1
SECTION	II:	School Personnel and Parent Perceptions (Original Follow Through Program)	4
SECTION	III:	Supportive Services and Parent Involvement . .	7
SECTION	IV:	School Personnel's Perception (Follow Through Expansion Program)	9
		Summary and Conclusions	13
		Glossary	15
		Appendix	19

SECTION I: COMPARATIVE PERFORMANCE OF FOLLOW THROUGH MODELS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS FOR THE FIVE YEARS, 1971-72 THROUGH 1975-1976

This section provides achievement information in Mathematics and Reading for the five years, 1971-72 through 1975-1976. The data are drawn from cross-sectional analyses, focusing primarily on mean score performance in Total Mathematics and Total Reading on city-wide tests (see appendix for test listing). Total Follow Through (TFT) performance was compared with Total Non-Follow Through (TNF) performance; with Districts 1-6 (TD 1-6) and with Total City (TC) performance. Comparisons were also made between models, as well as year by year comparisons.

Total Follow Through (TFT):

1) In both Mathematics and Reading within each grade of the K-3 span, TFT shows an overall pattern of improvement in the national percentile rank corresponding to the mean across five years. In Math in 1971-1972, percentiles ranged from a low of 20 (Grade 2) to a high of 40 (Grade 1); in 1975-1976, they ranged from a low of 45 (Grade 3) to a high of 64 (Grade K). In Reading in 1971-72, percentiles ranged again from a low of 20 (Grade 2) to a high of 48 (Grade K); in 1975-1976, they ranged from a low of 39 (Grade 3) to a high of 77 (Grade K). Particulary noticeable is the improvement in performance in both Math and Reading in Grades 2 and 3.

2) For the five year period, percentiles equaled or exceeded the national mean in 36% of the comparisons in Math and in 41% of the comparisons in Reading across the program grades.

3) Over the 5 years, mean scores exceeded those of Total NFT in 69% of the Math comparisons and in 50% of those in Reading.

4) Comparable percentages with respect to TD 1-6 were 33% in Math and 17% in Reading, while those in relation to TC were 11% and 6% in Math and Reading respectively.

Individual Model Performance

While the Total Program (TFT) shows continuous improvement in Grades K-3 across the five years, it is the Behavior Analysis Model (BA) which has produced the greatest positive effect on performance in these grades during this period. BA consistently ranks first among the models in both Math and Reading and by 1975-1976 had attained mean scores corresponding to the following national percentiles in Math across Grades K-3 respectively: 64, 71, 62 and 63, while the corresponding percentiles in Reading for these grades were: 80, 75, 61 and 49.

The Bank Street Model (BS) on the basis of its rankings (second in Math and third in Reading) across K-3 during this five year period, evidences the greatest positive effect after BA. In 1975-1976 it had attained the following percentiles in Math across K-3 respectively: 64, 63, 57 and 37, while its percentiles for these grades in Reading were: 80, 59, 50 and 39 respectively. (The Parent Implemented Model, (PI), found in one school only, could not be ranked over the five years, because it was not tested in 1972-1973; it had ranked high among the models recently on a year

NOTE: The entire set of computer programs for updating the longitudinal file had to be revised this year. Reports combining 1975-1976 and 1976-1977 quasi-longitudinal and longitudinal analyses will appear in the Fall of 1977, as will pupil continuance and absence reports.

by year basis.)

The Philadelphia Process Model (PP) ranked second in Reading across the five years and across K-3, principally because of improved performance in 1975-1976. PP ranked fifth in Math, however, the Educational Development Center Model (EDC) ranked third in Math and fourth in Reading, having improved substantially since 1974-1975. The Florida Parent Model (FP) ranked fourth in Math and fifth in Reading. The Bilingual Model (BI) ranked last in both subject matter areas.

SECTION II: SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND PARENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

Follow Through principals, staff developers, teachers and classroom aides in the original 18 schools, and a 10% parent sample were surveyed in the spring of 1976 to assess their perceptions of various aspects of the program. Questionnaires were sent to program staff, and the percentage of returns was 89% for principals, 78% for staff developers, 69% for K-3 teachers, and 65% for K-3 aides. A sample of the questionnaires is included in the appendix. To obtain parent perceptions of the program, a telephone survey was conducted during the summer of 1976. The design called for a 10% sample (N-578) stratified by grade within model. This telephone questionnaire is also included in the appendix.

Personal and Social Development of Pupils

Across the program, at least 63% of the teachers indicated that their respective models were effective in helping a child think for himself, relate to his peers, and view school as a positive experience. The majority of principals and staff developers also rated their model as effective in these areas, while the ratings of classroom aides in every model were significantly higher than those of teachers. Ninety to 94% of the K-3 parents indicated that their children enjoy school, are learning to think for themselves and get along with their peers.

Assessment of Curriculum

The effectiveness of the Follow Through program in the academic areas was generally considered most favorably by the aides, followed in order by staff developers, teachers and principals. According to teachers the most effective areas were Oral Expression (77%), Reading (72%), Arithmetic (69%)

and Creative Activities (64%). Parents rated Speaking Skills (92%), Creative Activities (92%), Writing Skills (90%), Reading and Arithmetic (87% respectively) as the most effective academic areas.

Importance of Pre-School Experience

There was agreement among teachers, staff developers and principals about the value of pre-school experience for pupils. Responses indicated that 81% of the principals, 78% of the staff developers and 85% of the teachers considered pre-school exposure important for success in all Follow Through models.

Classroom Aide Participation

Across the program, aides indicated that, on a regular basis, 5% assisted in instructing the whole class, while 90% helped with small groups, and 67% worked with individual children. Classroom aides were rated effective by 81% of the principals, 86% of the staff developers, and 89% of the teachers.

Parent Involvement

Responses from parents indicated that approximately 90% felt comfortable with school personnel and that their opinions were respected. The majority (64%) indicated that they attended school meetings, and 73% expressed interest in working in the schools. More than 95% felt that they were developing a greater interest in their child's education, and 80% expressed a greater interest in their own education.

School personnel were asked to rate the effectiveness of parent volunteers and parent scholars. Only 32% of all teachers in the program thought that parent volunteers were effective in the classroom. However,

it should be noted that 21% did not provide a rating. Staff developers and principals reported a higher rate of effectiveness (50% and 63%, respectively).

Parent scholars were found to be effective by 69% of the principals, 58% of the staff developers, and 50% of the teachers in the models where parent scholars are utilized, i.e. the Behavior Analysis, Florida Parent, Parent Implemented and Philadelphia Process Models.

Program Impact

The majority of teachers (74%), staff developers (93%), principals (51%) and aides (94%) indicated that working in the Follow Through Program had clarified their ideas of what education should do for the child. Similarly, the majority in each group reported increased interest in individualized instruction and reaching pupils' nomes. A large percentage of the aides (85%) also indicated that they had become interested in furthering their own education as a result of their involvement with Follow Through.

Parents (96%), staff developers (100%), teachers (83%) and aides (98%) expressed an overwhelming vote of confidence when asked if they would like to see the Follow Through Program continued. Teachers endorsed the program for a variety of reasons. The majority (62%) felt the program should be continued because it benefited and motivated pupils and provided a good curriculum and/or individualized instruction. Some (25%) mentioned that the program had provided more personnel and materials in the classroom, while others (14%) felt that the program had benefited parents and communities as much as the children it served.

SECTION III: SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE ORIGINAL FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

Information regarding the level of medical, dental, psychological and social services delivered to Follow Through children, as well as the level of parent involvement in the 18 schools was collected on a quarterly basis. Recording forms developed by the local evaluation staff were completed by school personnel, but in many instances incomplete information was made available.

The principal finding is that due to declining enrollment and increased costs over the years combined with the same funding, the level of supportive services to Follow Through children has been gradually decreasing.

Medical Services

Medical data indicate that approximately 4,500 children were screened for medical problems, i.e. 64% of the total Follow Through population. Of these children, 1,254 (28%) were referred for care and 634 (51% of those referred) received treatment. Escort and transportation services diminished in comparison with previous years due to increased costs.

Dental Services

Available dental data indicate that 4,298 children were screened for dental problems, i.e. 61% of the total Follow Through population. Of these children, 1,670 (39%) were referred for care and 742 children (44% of those referred) received treatment. Escort and transportation services were somewhat better provided for than for medical services.

Psychological Services

Information regarding psychological services indicates that 363 children (i.e. 5% of the total Follow Through population) were referred to psychological personnel, and that 275 children (76% of those referred) received direct psychological services. Additional indirect services were provided through staff development for teachers.

Social Services

Social services information indicates that fewer Follow Through School Community Coordinators were hired on a full-time basis in 1975-1976. Home visits numbered 8,770 as compared with 9,396 in the previous year, and 3,141 families (87% of those in need of help) received help, as compared with 4,968 in 1974-1975.

Parent Involvement

Information for parent involvement, although incomplete, indicates that the number of parents who helped the executive PAC at each school in planning parent activities amounted to 401 parents monthly across the total program. Nine of the 18 schools succeeded in having at least 70% of their Follow Through parent population attend one school meeting or affair during the year and the number of parent volunteer hours totaled 19,615, although this figure represents a significant decrease over the 1974-1975 year.

SECTION IV: SCHOOL PERSONNEL'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH EXPANSION PROGRAM

In March, 1975, the Follow Through Program was expanded at the kindergarten level to 46 additional schools in all eight districts. Each succeeding school year, i.e. September, 1975 and 1976 the program has been extended to a higher grade level, and is currently operating at the kindergarten, first and second grade levels. Five model options were proposed for implementation on the basis of previous evaluation findings regarding the original Follow Through Program in Philadelphia. Of these, four were selected by the participating schools: Option I: a local adaptation of the Behavior Analysis Model, Option 2: a Behavior Analysis/ Bank Street combination, Option 3: a Behavior Analysis/Bilingual combination (available but not selected by any of the participating schools), Option 4: a local adaptation of the Bank Street Model, and Option 5: a Bank Street/Bilingual combination.

In the spring of 1976, questionnaires parallel to those completed by staff in the original Follow Through Program, were sent to Expansion Program principals, resource teachers and instructional personnel (kindergarten and first grade). Forty-one of 46 principals, 15 resource teachers, 240 classroom teachers, 220 aides and 193 parent scholars returned completed questionnaires.

Educational Ideals

In general, Expansion Program principals indicated that they were satisfied with the instructional option in their school. Forty-six percent (46%) felt that their particular option was related to their

teacher training experience, and 76% felt it was closely related to their beliefs about how children learn. Sixty-eight percent (68%) indicated that their instructional option was effective in helping a child think for himself; learn to relate to his age group (80%), and view school as a positive experience (90%).

The majority of resource teachers (13/17) and classroom teachers (64%) expressed enthusiasm towards working in their particular instructional option, and considered it to be related to their beliefs about how children learn (14/17 and 62% respectively). Most also rated their option as effective in helping a child: think for himself (9/17 and 59% respectively); relate to his age group (10/17 and 63% respectively); and view school as a positive experience (11/17 and 63% respectively).

As a group, aides and parent scholars expressed an even higher degree of enthusiasm than teachers toward working in their instructional option (83% and 89% respectively). Similarly, a higher percentage of aides (83%) and parent scholars (73%) rated their option as effective in helping a child think for himself; relate to his age group (79% and 76% respectively); and view school as a positive experience (77% and 72% respectively).

Assessment of Curriculum

The majority in each group, with the exception of Option II teachers; considered their respective option as having an effective approach to Reading, Arithmetic, Handwriting and Oral Expression. Overall, the approach to Creative Activities was considered less effective, and with the exception of Option IV teachers, much lower ratings were assigned to Social Studies, Science and Written Expression.

Staff Development

Eighty-two percent (82%) of the principals felt that the Expansion Program had had a positive effect on staff development at their school, while 37% of the teachers rated the staff development they received as "very effective" and 37% rated it as "somewhat effective." The majority of aides (54%) also felt that the staff development they received was "very effective." Fifty-nine percent (59%) of the parent scholars indicated that they received special training in classroom instruction from once a week to once a month, and 76% found it to be "very effective."

Importance of Pre-school Experience

As might be expected, 83% of the principals, almost all of the resource teachers and 84% of the classroom teachers considered pre-school experience as either important or very important for a child's success in their respective options.

Classroom Aide and Parent Participation

In response to questions about the effectiveness of aides, parent scholars and parent volunteers, the majority of principals and teachers considered aides and parent scholars effective, but often provided no rating for parent volunteers, suggesting that parent volunteers may not be utilized universally.

The overwhelming majority of aides and parent scholars indicated that they instructed small groups regularly, but more of their time was spent on the instruction of individual children in Options IV and V than in the other options.

Program Impact

After one year of program operation, the majority of principals indicated that the Expansion Program had had a positive effect on achievement (68%); parent participation (75%); staff development (83%) and the motivation of instructional personnel (78%). The majority in each of the groups also indicated that working in the program had clarified their ideas of what education should do for the child, and increased their interest in individualized instruction as well as reaching the home.

As a result of the Expansion Program, 80% of the aides and 83% of the parent scholars indicated that they were interested in furthering their education. When asked if they would like to see the program continued, all of the resource teachers, 78% of the classroom teachers, 94% of the aides and 95% of the parent scholars answered in the affirmative.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Achievement data over the five years, 1971-72 through 1975-76 in Reading and Mathematics shows continuous improvement in Grades K-3 for the Total Program (TFT). The Behavior Analysis Model (BA) has produced the greatest positive effect on performance in these grades during this period. BA consistently ranks first among the models in both Reading and Math, while Bank Steet ranks second in Math and third in Reading, and Philadelphia Process ranks second in Reading and EDC third in Math.

A survey of program personnel and parents in the original Follow Through program's 18 schools indicates that most teachers, aides, staff developers and principals felt their respective models were helping pupils' personal, social and academic development. According to teachers across models, the most effective subject areas were Oral Expression (77%), Reading (72%), Arithmetic (69%) and Creative Activities (64%). Indications of the program's impact were found in the large percentages of school personnel who reported increased interest in individualized instruction, reaching pupils' homes, and furthering their own education. All of the staff developers, 83% of the teachers, 98% of the classroom aides and 96% of the parents also indicated that they would like to see the Follow Through program continued.

Supportive services and parent involvement information indicate that due to declining enrollment and increased costs over the years combined with the same funding, the level of services has been gradually decreasing. Fifty-one percent (51%) of those children referred for medical care received treatment, while 44% of those referred for dental care received treatment. Although only 5% of the children in the total Follow Through population were referred for psychological services, 76% of those referred received direct

services. Social Services information indicates that home visits numbered 8,770 and that 87% of those families in need of help received help. Parent involvement information indicates that 401 parents across the program helped their executive PACs monthly in planning parent activities, and that a total of 19,615 parent volunteer hours were donated to the program.

A survey conducted with school personnel and principals in the Follow Through Expansion Program at the kindergarten and first grade levels indicates that the majority of respondents considered their instructional option effective in helping pupils' personal, social and academic development. Option II teachers, however, tended to view their option as ineffective. Teachers across the program considered Reading (81%), Arithmetic (72%), Handwriting Skills (67%) and Oral Expression (66%) as the most effective subject areas. When asked if they would like to see the program continued, all of the resource teachers, 76% of the classroom teachers, 94% of the aides and 95% of the parent scholars answered in the affirmative.

GLOSSARY

BANK STREET MODEL:

The ultimate objective of the Bank Street approach is to enable the child in his initial years of schooling to build a positive image of himself as a learner. The teacher introduces activities and plans events, but teaching is in terms of how the individual child responds with a strong emphasis on diagnosis and individualized follow-up. The curriculum progresses from child-oriented to social content within the context of relevant classroom and community themes.

In Reading, a traditional basal approach is employed utilizing the Bank Street Series. In Math, the Singer Series is used.

BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS MODEL:

Primary emphasis is given to the basic academic skills of reading, arithmetic and handwriting, using programmed materials and a token economy.

In Reading, the McGraw Hill-Sullivan Series is employed, which is a programmed linguistic approach with a strong decoding emphasis. In Math, the Singer Series is used.

BILINGUAL MODEL:

The program is designed for Black and Puerto Rican children, and addresses itself to both linguistic and cultural differences. Instruction is initiated in the child's dominant language, and bicultural experiences are an integral part of the program.

In Philadelphia, the Lippincott Reading Series, a linguistically-oriented basal approach is employed at two schools. At the third school, Bank Street Readers are used in conjunction with SEDL materials. In Math, two schools utilize the School District's Activity Guide supplemented by either CEMEROL materials or Exploring Elementary Math. The third school uses Houghton-Mifflin in Kindergarten and Addison-Wesley in grades 1-3.

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER (EDC):

The approach stresses the "open classroom," attempting to be responsive to the individual needs of children while simultaneously taking into account the particular talents and styles of individual teachers. Traditional academic skills are important, but children have the chance to pursue them in more flexible, self-directed ways.

In Philadelphia, the EDC schools utilize the Lippincott Series, Houghton-Mifflin Readers and the Bank Street Series for Reading. In Math, Addison Wesley, SRA and the Holt Series are utilized.

FLORIDA PARENT EDUCATION MODEL:

The key element of the program is the training of community people in the combined role of parent educator and teacher aide. The parent educator makes periodic home visits to demonstrate to the mother learning tasks aimed at fostering the child's development.

In Philadelphia, the McGraw Hill-Sullivan Reading Series is used at both schools in this model, although B.R.L.-Sullivan (a programmed linguistic approach) and the Bank Street Series are employed as supplementary materials. Singer Math materials are utilized in all grades at both schools.

PARENT IMPLEMENTED MODEL:

Parent involvement is the keynote of this model, which is represented by one school. However, it should be noted that the parental component has been a priority area throughout the program in Philadelphia. In 1968-1969, the Parent Board selected the Philadelphia Process approach for the instructional component within this model.

In Reading, the Scott-Foresman Series is utilized which employs a traditional basal approach. In Math, Addison-Wesley materials are utilized.

PHILADELPHIA PROCESS MODEL:

The focus of this program is a process approach to learning, using the AAAS science materials as a prototype for teaching in all curriculum areas.

In Reading, the Lippincott Series, Bank Street Readers, Sullivan McGraw-Hill Programmed Readers and Scott-Foresman Basal Readers are utilized, based on

teacher discretion. In Math, the kindergarten classes employ Harcourt Brace. First grade utilizes "New Ways in Numbers," second grade uses Silver Burdette, while the third grade employs Field Math Publications, supplemented by Laidlaw Bros.

EXPANSION PROGRAM OPTIONS

OPTION I: A local adaptation of the Behavior Analysis Model, see page 15.

OPTION II: A Behavior Analysis/Bank Street combination, utilizing Behavior Analysis techniques in conjunction with Bank Street materials, see page 15.

OPTION III: A Behavior Analysis/Bilingual combination. However, this option was not selected by the participating schools.

OPTION IV: A local adaptation of the Bank Street Model, see page 15.

OPTION V: A Bank Steet/Bilingual combination, see page 15.

REPORTS

Atkins, J., and Goodwin, J. — Supportive Services and Parent Involvement in Follow Through in Philadelphia, 1975-1976. Report #77123, Office of Research and Evaluation, The School District of Philadelphia, March, 1977.

Johnson, C., and Goodwin, J. — Program Personnel's Perceptions of the Follow Through Expansion Program in Philadelphia, 1975-1976. Report #77126, Office of Research and Evaluation, The School District of Philadelphia, February, 1977.

Lukshus, A. — School Personnel and Parent Perceptions of the Follow Through Program in Philadelphia, 1975-1976. Report #7723, Office of Research and Evaluation, The School District of Philadelphia, October, 1976.

McKinney, J. T. — Follow Through Pupil Achievement Characteristics in Philadelphia, 1971-1972 through 1975-1976. Report #77121, Office of Research and Evaluation, The School District of Philadelphia, January, 1977.

APPENDIX

LISTING OF ACHIEVEMENT TESTS FOR THE FIVE YEAR PERIOD 1971-1972 THROUGH 1975-1976

Spring, 1972:

Kindergarten - Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Grades 1-2 - Metropolitan Achievement Test

Grade 3 - Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

Spring, 1973

Kindergarten - Metropolitan Achievement Test

Grades 1-3 - Metropolitan Achievement Test

Spring, 1974

Kindergarten - Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Grades 1-3 - California Achievement Test

Winter, 1975

Kindergarten - Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Grades 1-4 - California Achievement Test

Winter, 1976

Kindergarten - Stanford Early School Achievement Test

Grades 1-4 - California Achievement Test

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
Office of Research and Evaluation
Follow Through Evaluation, April, 1976

FOLLOW THROUGH STAFF DEVELOPER AND TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Please circle the number or supply the information requested to answer the questions below.

1. School _____

2. Follow Through Model _____

_____

3.

Staff Developer	1
Teacher	2

If teacher, grade taught this year ☐

4. Circle each year in which you have participated in the Follow Through Program.

1968-69 1969-70 1970-71 1971-72
1972-73 1973-74 1974-75 1975-76

5. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

Less than 2	1
2-5	2
5-10	3
More than 10	4

6. What is the highest level of school you completed?

BA	1
MA	2
MA+	3

7. Sex:

Male	1
Female	2

8. Age:

Under 30	1
30-50	2
Over 50	3

9. How often do you receive Staff Development?

Once a week	1
Every other week	2
Once a month	3
Other _____	

10. In your opinion how effective is the Staff Development Program?

Very effective	1
Somewhat effective	2
Not at all effective	3

11. How closely related are Follow Through model ideals to your education and training experiences?

1 2 3 4 5

How effective is your Follow Through Model for helping a child.....	VERY EFFECTIVE				NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE
12. Think for himself	1	2	3	4	5
13. Learn to relate to his age group	1	2	3	4	5
14. View school as a positive experience	1	2	3	4	5

How well does the Follow Through Model provide an effective approach to the following academic areas?	VERY WELL				POORLY
15. Reading	1	2	3	4	5
16. Arithmetic	1	2	3	4	5
17. Social Studies	1	2	3	4	5
18. Science	1	2	3	4	5
19. Handwriting Skills	1	2	3	4	5
20. Written Expression	1	2	3	4	5
21. Oral Expression	1	2	3	4	5
22. Creative Activities	1	2	3	4	5

Please indicate the effectiveness of the various types of classroom help available to you.

Type of Classroom Help	VERY EFFECTIVE				NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE
23. Full time aide . . .	1	2	3	4	5
24. Parent volunteers . . .	1	2	3	4	5
25. Parent Scholars . . .	1	2	3	4	5

Has working in the Follow Through Model:	YES	NO
26. Clarified your ideas of what education should do for the child	1	2
27. Increased your interest in individualized instruction	1	2
28. Increased your interest in reaching the home	1	2

29. In general, how important do you think pre-school experience is for success in the Follow Through Model?

VERY IMPORTANT				NOT AT ALL IMPORTANT
1	2	3	4	5

30. Would you like to see the Follow Through Program continued?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't Know	9

31. Please specify the reasons for your response to Question 30.

FOLLOW THROUGH PARENTS' QUESTIONNAIRE

SCHOOL_____ GRADE_____

Please let us know how you feel about the Follow Through Program by responding to the statements below. Simply circle the "1" on each line if you agree with the statement or a "2" if you disagree.

		AGREE	DISAGREE
1.	My child enjoys school.	1	2
2.	My child is learning to think for himself.	1	2
3.	My child is learning to get along well with children his own age.	1	2
	I like the way my child is being taught:		
4.	Reading	1	2
5.	Arithmetic	1	2
6.	Science	1	2
7.	Social Studies	1	2
8.	Writing Skills	1	2
9.	Speaking Skills	1	2
10.	How to be creative	1	2
11.	I am developing a greater interest in my child's education.	1	2
12.	I am developing a greater interest in my own education. . .	1	2
13.	I attend school meetings.	1	2
14.	I feel comfortable speaking to school personnel.	1	2
15.	I would like to work in the school.	1	2
16.	I feel my opinions are respected in the school.	1	2

		YES	NO
17.	The Follow Through Program should be continued.	1	2